



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,283	06/06/2001	Akira Kudo	1359.1049	6300

21171 7590 12/16/2003  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/874,283	Applicant(s) KUDO ET AL.	
	Examiner VAN H NGUYEN	Art Unit 2126	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                               | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2 and 5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application filed June 6, 2001. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Crozier** (U.S. 5,666,553) cited by Applicant in the IDS (paper #5).

As to **claim 7**, Crozier teaches (*col.3, line 3-col.4, line 6 & col.16, lines 2-44*) an integrated information processing system including a plurality of information processing means, the plurality of information processing means including information processing based on different architectures means (*transfer, compare and reconcile data between any other pair of disparate platforms ...translating data between disparate computer platforms*), the system comprising:

- collaboration information storage means for storing collaboration information among the plurality of information processing means (*dynamically reconcile the information of two database files... choosing corresponding records from the two files*); and

- a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and allowing the information processing means to collaborate with each other (*establishing a mapping between the fields of the two record structures, and using that mapping to translate the data of a source file into the destination record structure/ interactively reconcile records of a first and a second database, wherein the record structures of the first and second database are different*).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Crozier** in view of **Banavar et al.** (U.S. 6, 425,016).

**As to claim 9**, the rejection of claim 7 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 9, however, further recites “generating role objects respectively corresponding to the



information processing means; and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects.”

Crozier is silent on the limitations above.

Banavar teaches generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means; and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects (abstract; col.4, lines 13-22; and col.5, line 50-col.6, line 4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Banavar with Crozier because it would have provided the capability for ensuring the consistency of the objects of the collaboration.

**As to claim 1**, the rejection of claim 7 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 1, however, further recites “generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means; and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects.”

As to “generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means; and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects,” note the discussion of claim 9 above for rejection.

**As to claim 2**, Crozier teaches the collaboration information contains timing information on timing of passing of information between the information processing means (col.13, lines 5-67 and col.15, lines 1-25).

**As to claim 3**, Crozier teaches the timing information is selected from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication, delayed batch communication, and batch communication (col.13, lines 5-67 and col.15, lines 1-25).

**As to claim 4**, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 4, however, further recites “information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means.”

Crozier is silent on the limitations above.

Banavar teaches information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means (col.3, lines 11-15; col.4, lines 39-44; and col.5, lines 50-66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Banavar with Crozier because it would have provided the capability for identifying the objects of the collaboration.

**As to claims 5-6**, note the rejection of claims 2-3 supra.

**Claim 8** includes the same subject matter as in claim 4, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 10**, note the rejection of claim 4 supra.

### *Conclusion*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Barkley et al. US 6202066 issued date: 03/2001
- Carter US 5787175 issued date: 07/1998
- Conner, Jr. et al. US 5263167 issued date: 11/1993
- Kolland et al. "Information Sharing in Collaborative Environments" 1994 IEEE, pp.140-154.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.


**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or fax to:**

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)  
(703) 746-7238 (for After Final communications)  
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications)

VHN  
December 11, 2003

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100